

**Skagit County Planning Commission
Joint Meeting with the Board of County Commissioners
Work Session: Shoreline Master Program Update
March 9, 2021**

Planning

Commissioners: Kathy Mitchell
Mark Lundsten
Mark Knutzen
Amy Hughes
Tim Raschko, Chair
Joe Woodmansee
Tammy Candler, Vice Chair
Martha Rose
Joseph Shea

Board of County

Commissioners: Lisa Janicki, Chair
Ron Wesen
Peter Browning

Staff:

Hal Hart, Planning Director
Michael Cerbone, Assistant Planning Director
Peter Gill, Long Range Planning Manager
Betsy Stevenson, Senior Planner
Daniel Hasenoehrl, Planning Intern

Others:

Dan Nickel, Consultant (The Watershed Company)

Chair Tim Raschko: Okay. Welcome to the March 9th, 2021, meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission. It's now called to order. We'll start with the roll call. Please respond when I call your name. Commissioner Candler?

Vice Chair Tammy Candler: Present.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Amy Hughes: Here.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Knutzen?

Commissioner Mark Knutzen: I'm here.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Lundsten?

Commissioner Mark Lundsten: Here.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Kathy Mitchell: Here.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Martha Rose: Here.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Shea?

Commissioner Joseph Shea: Present.

Chair Raschko: And Commissioner Woodmansee?

Commissioner Joe Woodmansee: Present.

Chair Raschko: Great. Thank you all for being here. Would anybody please entertain a motion to approve the minutes?

Commissioner Mitchell: I approve the minutes. It's Mitchell.

Chair Raschko: You *move* to approve them?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, sir. I move to approve them. Thank you.

Vice Chair Candler: I will second. Commissioner Candler.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. So it's been moved and seconded to approve the minutes. Is there any discussion on the minutes?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: If not, then all in favor, say "aye."

Multiple Commissioners: Aye.

Chair Raschko: And aye. Any opposed, please say "nay."

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, so the minutes are approved. Okay, we are going to recess this meeting of the Planning Commission and call to order a joint meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission and the Skagit County Commissioners. In so doing, Commissioner Janicki, can you call your meeting _____, please?

(technical problem with sound)

Board Chair Lisa Janicki: Tim, are you able to hear me?

Chair Raschko: I can hear you.

Chair Janicki: Peter Gill, can you mute that? Thank you.

Peter Gill: Yes.

Chair Janicki: All right. Good. Well, I'm Lisa Janicki. It is 6:03 p.m. and I'd like to call to order the Board of County Commissioners. Commissioners Browning and Wesen and I are all here tonight, and I really want to thank Chair Raschko and all of the Planning Commissioners for allowing us to be here to join your meeting. We are, I guess, just looking forward to having a closer working relationship with the Planning Commission and wanted to take this time to do some introductions and, I guess, hopefully walk away from here with a better idea of what the Board of Commissioners, you know, is hoping for with the Commission and to have the Planning Commissioner members all get a better, you know, communication with us. So, Chair Raschko, what I'd love to do is have an introduction (and) let your Commissioners self-introduce, since we do have Peter Browning here as a brand new Commissioner, and just take a couple minutes to, you know, give your name, your background and maybe just, you know, two or three minutes of why you're doing this incredibly tough job. And Tim, is it easier for you to call on your Commissioners one at a time? What's the best process?

Chair Raschko: Well, I'll call on them one at a time and I'll go ahead and go first, if that's all right.

Chair Janicki: Please.

Chair Raschko: Yeah, I'm Tim Raschko. I'm on the Skagit County Planning Commission. I grew up in Seattle, as did my wife. We moved here in 1978 so we're still newcomers, and moved here for employment and opportunity. So I worked for 42 years in the timber industry, basically in land management, and I retired at the end of 2013. Prior to that, I also served as a board member of Skagit Valley Hospital for 15 years. And we both – my wife and I – always felt that we should be involved in the community. She serves on boards as well. Anyway, it was in 2016 that I was approached to take a position on the Planning Commission to replace somebody who was in the timber industry that had to move because of a job opportunity. And so I agreed to do that again, you know, basically in the desire to give back to the community. And basically it's been very fulfilling. It's been very interesting and challenging and at times it's been – what do I say? It's been difficult. Anyway, it's something that I look forward to continuing and I appreciate the opportunity to serve. So with that, I would call on Commissioner Candler. Could you please say some words about yourself?

Vice Chair Candler: Absolutely. Thank you. Hi, this is Tammy Candler, Commissioner Candler, and I have lived in Skagit County most of my life. I was born in Sedro-Woolley; went to school in Sedro-Woolley; lived in the Seattle area for a while during my college and law school; left the state; worked in Nashville at the Attorney General's office for a few years as a paralegal; came back; and I now work for the County at the Public Defender's office. It's not related to, obviously, the civil side of land use and so I enjoy this opportunity to do volunteer work for the County and to kind of learn about the issues. I'm always – I continue to be very impressed by the other members of this Commission, how seriously they take this work, and I appreciate serving with them. I live in unincorporated Skagit County like everybody, but in the area that I absolutely love. I think it's the most beautiful place in the world, but that's my biased opinion! And that's all.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Hughes, please.

Commissioner Hughes: Hi, my name's Amy Hughes. I like to think Skagit County raised me. My dad brought my family here when I was eight and immediately he put us out in the fields to start helping the farmers bring the crops in, but he also taught me how to fish on the rivers and my brother – my new brother – taught me how to ski on Big Lake. So from there we played on the

beaches around Skagit County. We toured the San Juans weekly. Every weekend that's where we were. And then as a young adult I joined a farm family. So the natural resource grounds of Skagit County are real dear to me.

As hobbies, my hobbies are taking me to the mountaintops now, so from the ocean to the mountaintops. We live in a special place. My hope for what we're doing in Skagit County is to figure out a way for us all to work together better so we *can* do what we want to do. There's so much passion for making Skagit County a little bit different than just a suburb, and so I hope we can do that. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Amy. Commissioner Knutzen, please.

Commissioner Knutzen: Yeah, thank you, Tim. My name is Mark Knutzen and I just came on the board last August. I took Annie Lohman's place. I was born and grew up in Burlington, graduated in 1971, went to Skagit Valley College and WSU and studied ag, and then I came back in 1974 and started farming fulltime with two brothers. I got married in 1976 to my still-first wife and raised three kids – and got six grandkids, though. Our first crops were peas and seed crops and grain crops and in the mid-1980s we started growing potatoes like a lot of farmer families here in the valley did. And we did that until the mid – I think 2013 we sold our warehouse. And my two brothers still farm but I rent most of mine out and I'm retired. When I was farming, I was on a half-a-dozen different boards and still belong to several different organizations. I fill my time now – I'm also on the – I'm on this group but I'm also on the Burlington Historical Society and, like I said, I've got six grandkids so I'm a grandparent and very happy to be that way. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Mark. Commissioner Lundsten?

Commissioner Lundsten: Thank you. My name is Mark Lundsten. I bought property here with my wife in 2003 and we built a house and moved in and lived here ever since. I have two children who live in – grown children – who live in Skagit County and two grandchildren as well who live nearby. I fished commercially in Alaska. I've lived 35 years in Seattle and was up here often. Know the country well. And fished in Alaska and was on a family-owned boat, a 70-foot boat, a five-man crew, and I was a working skipper. I was also involved in politics.

I'd like to dive into another subject that has to do with this evening very much – very quickly. And if I – because I am resigning from the Planning Commission effective immediately, and if Lisa and Tim would allow me I have a very brief statement – a couple minutes. I choose not to serve because I think the group has inappropriately and actively sought to repress the free expression of ideas, pure and simple. I mean other Commissioners and the public. I'm not asking the Planning Commission or the Board to change any decisions to remove the censure. I have protested it and done my best at doing so, and I have failed to convince them to change their mind. I simply ask that the Board direct and work with the Planning Commission as you look ahead. The Planning Commission serves as a representative of the Board to the public, and it is an arm of the government and it needs to follow government rules. And as we all know, the PC – the Planning Commission – censured me for disagreeing with them in public outside of deliberations, and they subsequently confirmed that censure by a vote of six to three even after a rebuttal of their claims and the clear opinion of the prosecuting attorney who supported my position, not to mention a very recent relevant by the Washington Supreme Court. So that reconfirmation of the censure was a vote, it seems to me, against plain evidence and common sense. They simply exercised the majority because they could and that is not good. They became self-appointed gatekeepers for the Board, which is not supposed to be their job. As Mr. Weyrich stated, the censure had no legal effect, but the effect of the censure was still very real. It was damaging. It was damaging to

me, to the Planning Commission itself, to the Board of Skagit County, and, most importantly, to the public. It did not promote transparent deliberation or trust for anyone. Now is that what we want the Planning Commission to do? I don't think so. As we all know, silence is consent, so if the Board agrees with –

Chair Raschko: I'd like to make a point of order.

Commissioner Lundsten: I'm just – I'm wrapping up –

Chair Raschko: This was an introduction, all right? This was going to be a forward-looking meeting. Mark, we're going to have a time at the end of our meeting where you can make a statement. Now we're going to move on with introductions. Thank you. So – no, Mark. You're going to have your time. Nobody is trying to take away your freedom of speech. We're just trying to do introductions.

All right. So we're going to move on then to Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: Good evening. Thank you. A brief overview: I moved here in 1999 with my husband. We retired and bought some forest property and went through the forest stewardship program, then learned as quickly as we could how to take care of the lands with everything that goes with it. The DNR, of course, was excellent and extensive. Before that I had gotten my degree in geology but before that – this is the interesting thing about it wrapping up to the forestry – I was a biology major so I had a strong science background and I thought I was going to retire and become a forest ranger – you know, came from school and another life and that kind of thing – because I loved the forest – hiking, kayaking, backpacking, everything to do with nature and helping conserve the lands. And at the time we lived in Oklahoma and the geology was a much better course for keeping a roof over my head so I went that route and loved geology and still do to this day – rock hound for life. After we retired here, I had some spare time. Continuing education is always paramount. I became a master gardener and delved into gardening and weeds and issues and everything that you can imagine how it wraps up with the land. And we had the opportunity to join the local fire department – Edison Fire Department's an excellent group – and do some volunteer work for first responder, as also a safety officer, and enjoyed everything that goes with. Now how this wraps up to where we come today, there were so many land issues that would pop up, as you can imagine, that encompasses all of those things and there were a number of issues that came up between 2008 until probably 2013, 14, that really caught my interest that land planning – land use planning – everything else is very intricate, complicated, and fascinating. And so when I applied to get on the Planning Commission and had an interview with Commissioner Wesen, one of the first questions he asked – which I will remember to this day and tell the story as often as anybody'll let me – is he said – he asked me two questions. The first one was, What is your favorite area of Skagit? What do you like best about Skagit? And I thought, Holy Moly, what a question! But the gut reaction is the forest. I just replied "the forest" because I love the forest, the trees, and everything. Now remember, coming from the Plains states this place is wonderful with the trees and the forests.

The second thing Commissioner Wesen asked – because I had told him at that point that I wanted to shut the door behind us and preserve Skagit exactly the way it was. And he asked a very good question. He says, What are you going to do with the people when they move here? Right! Okay! So mind set: How we're going to plan for the future and allow people to have land use, business use, and all kinds of uses. We've got three main industries here: four or more if you think of some others, and it was all fascinating. So thank you, Commissioner Wesen, and the other

Commissioners that allowed us to work with this over time. And all this together has just been very interesting – educational beyond belief – and I thank you guys for the opportunity.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Kathy. Commissioner Rose, please.

Commissioner Rose: Thank you. So I grew up in the Midwest, right outside of Chicago, and I watched the farms turn into the housing developments. And when I was 13 my family moved us to Arlington, Virginia, and I watched the same thing happen around the beltway of DC, and when I was – in 1972 I got a job in construction as a carpenter's helper and I participated in that destruction of farmland. And after a couple of years, I moved out to Portland, Oregon, continued – I've been in construction for 48 years and the first 10 years was pounding nails. But when I was in the Portland area I did a lot of infill development on crews but then I also worked out in the filbert orchards. And I made a vow that I would stop that. I don't like the watching our farmland disappear and turn into housing developments. So I spent 33 years in Seattle after living in rural Grays Harbor for five years, and then five-and-a-half years ago moved up to Skagit, and my son Silas preceded me here and convinced me to move up here. I wasn't here that long before I was asked by Wayne at SICBA – I'm a member of SICBA, Skagit and Island County Builders – if I'd consider the Planning Commission, and Lisa graciously gave me that spot.

So my position is the same. I'm very much against developing farmland and I want to see it preserved, and I'm one of the few builders you'll meet that thinks the Growth Management Act is a good idea. And I'm a member of other organizations, too, like the Equal Building Guild and Sustainable Connections, and a member of the Chamber. And I love our natural world and want to keep it that way. At the same time, I'm a spec builder so I understand the need for housing but I also look around me in my own little town of Sedro-Woolley and I see so much land within the city boundaries that could be densified. And, I mean, that's the way I think our development for housing should go. We should be following the lead of cities that choose density within the urban boundaries and leave the outer areas intact. I think that's enough. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Martha. Commissioner Shea, please.

Commissioner Shea: Thank you. My name's Joseph Shea. I was born in Prosser, Washington, actually, a very pretty small town over there. But we came over here from eastern Washington in 1995, our family, and we've been beef farming over here ever since on the Samish River. I also went to Skagit Valley College. I got my Bachelor's in environmental conservation there. I also got my certificate and kind of minored in geographic information systems, so I understand maps pretty well. Also tutored in a lot of math and things like that. But throughout my time here in the county I've worked with various different – I guess I worked with XL Construction specifically, various farms in the valley, as well as the Cascade Mall, the Burlington Outlets, a lot of the things that our younger individuals in our community kind of have to go through. But something I've noticed just through my time at Skagit County – I've been working there since 2015 as the noxious weed coordinator – I think there's a lot of instances where the younger community isn't necessarily being represented in a lot of ways, and a lot of these land use changes and things like that are really going to impact those community members way down the line, and so I thought that with just with my experience, my knowledge, and my willingness to kind of put the time in, I thought that I might be able to help bring a more productive perspective, I guess, to the table. The main thing is still to me and why I kind of wanted to go for the Planning Commission was when I grew up on the Samish River and I had firsthand experience just with the social interaction with regards to buffers and things like that along waterways and I think that the Voluntary Stewardship Program that the County put on was a really genius way to get people onboard. I think it was a good way to give people options and – rather than ultimatums, and that opened a lot more doors. And so I

just really want to try to incentivize and work on programs similar to that. And I think a lot of our community is willing to make the changes necessary to be better stewards of our land. It's just giving them the options and the ability to do so is pretty important. So that's it for me.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe. Commissioner Woodmansee, please.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Good evening. I was born in Sedro-Woolley and shortly after that my folks moved to California for a few years and we moved back in 1977, my junior year in high school. I met my future wife there and I've been married since 1980. I am a third generation business owner in Skagit County. My grandfather had a cabinet shop way back in the day; my father took that over in the late '70s; and I currently work for my son, so are fourth generation business owners in Skagit County. And BYK Construction is our company. I'm really enjoying doing that. For 38 years I had my own company in Skagit County. I appreciate Skagit County. It is – I do believe that Skagit County is – I think that the County has done a decent job of preserving our county. And I agree about farmland. I think that it's something that needs to be protected to the best of our ability and is a very high important thing to me. I also am looking for – balance is important to me too, and so when I was approached to come onto the Commission I was replacing somebody in the construction industry that had stepped down and so I think it's good to have the different experiences out there. And I spent 38 years on the other side of the counter, so to speak, in developing and building houses and stuff like that, and so it has been quite an experience being on the backside of the counter and being the person hearing proposals and hearing future code proposals and that kind of stuff, and so I've actually enjoyed that a lot. And I appreciate the opportunity to work with the Commission, and I think that they're diverse and I think that we – I guess I'd just say that we – I feel like that we do get a lot done and we're able to express ourselves well. So I guess that's what I have to say. I'm looking forward to the next year. I've been here for about a year-and-a-half, or a little bit longer than that, so I'm actually still a pretty new commissioner. I appreciate the opportunity.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Joe. So Commissioner Janicki, would you like to take over?

Chair Janicki: Okay. Are you able to hear me?

Chair Raschko: Yes.

Chair Janicki: Yeah, okay. On my screen I still have a marked out microphone so it looks kind of funny. You know, thank you to the Planning Commission members. It takes a little bit to open yourself and talk about yourself. I would love to have been doing this in a room with a little hospitality going on. That would have been the ideal situation, but on Microsoft Teams meeting it makes it possible. I'm going to turn the microphone over to Commissioner Wesen. And, Commissioners, if you two can give just a tiny bit of background. I know we all have a few prepared remarks, but if you want to share a little bit and then share your remarks, that would be great. So go ahead, Commissioner Wesen.

Commissioner Ron Wesen: Thank you, Commissioner Janicki. I really appreciate the chance of being here with the Planning Commission. I think there're a lot of great things you guys have been able to do over the years.

A little about myself: I'm a fourth generation dairy farmer. I live out in the Edison area. I farm with my four brothers and my parents. I graduated from Burlington High School in 1977, went down to Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, got a degree in dairy science, met my wife, came back and got married. We've been on the farm fulltime since then. I was elected County Commissioner in 2009 and so

I've been a County Commissioner here now starting my 13th year. Our farm – we have – we're farming about a thousand acres. We're milking about 700, 800 cows, and so agriculture's very dear to me. I've been involved in the Farm Bureau, Dairy Federation, and I'm also a drainage district commissioner, so I understand those issues that affect agriculture and I really appreciate the diversity we have on this Planning Commission.

So that's a little bit about myself. I really enjoy being County Commissioner, dealing with all the different issues we are dealing with, and I really want to thank you as Planning Commission people being here. I think you do a great service for the community. I have watched every meeting that has taken place since I was elected. I think it's really important to understand the discussion that takes place from the citizens and from yourself. Like I said, I value your contribution and your dedication and the amount of time and effort you put into your deliberations and understanding the subject. I think it's really an extension of our Planning Department. You know, our Planning Department needs to hear what happens in the real world out in the community and so I think that's what your communication skills bring back to us. I really do appreciate that.

Some of the things that I think you've been able to accomplish here just recently is our flood code amendments. Those are required because of the FEMA and our flood insurance programs. We have to go through all those things. We've had the planning docket and Comprehensive Plan amendments that happen every year, and (it's) really important for everybody to look at those things. Our Countywide Planning Policies are updated constantly and every year we have our Capital Facilities Plan that you spend a lot of time looking at and understanding what we're doing there. Also the training that is necessary for the Open Public Meetings laws and the Department of Commerce's planning department and planning rules. I appreciate all the different work you've done in working with the Planning Department on helping upgrade the website, and I really, again, appreciate all your volunteer time and so forth. Like I said, watching your meetings – and you know, some of them were an hour, some of them were two or three hours, so there's a lot of different things you're dealing with and I do appreciate the time it takes for you to be here, but I realize it takes time away from your family and your other activities and your work. So thank you for that. I think the citizens of Skagit County are much – benefit from your devotion and time you spend on the subjects. So thank you again for that.

Chair Janicki: Commissioner Browning, would you like to share some remarks? Peter, I can't hear you. Or is that –

Commissioner Peter Browning: All right, now I'm set. Sorry.

Chair Janicki: Yeah. Good.

Commissioner Browning: So I grew up in Whatcom County on an organic farm but we also had a house in La Conner, so I – kind of like Amy, who I've had a great conversation with before – I feel like I grew up here in Skagit County. Really during the formative years I was spending more time in Skagit than Whatcom. I raised – all the local neighbors, I'd buy all their bull calves and raise them and sell them to feed lots, and bought a whole bunch of wild horses and trained them so I had kind of a weird childhood but I loved it. It was great. We still have the farm. We still – still organic and it's been very, very popular for a rental. I don't do anything more there as a farmer.

I did go off to WSU. In fact, Mark, I was there the same years you were there and I hope you showed better judgment in the local bars over in Moscow. But I really enjoyed WSU. It was a great place. After there I went to Colorado to Aspen and owned a restaurant then built a bunch of restaurants for other folks. After a while, I realized it wasn't my favorite career so I went on and

moved on and went back to school and ended up in some levels of medicine and public health. And, in fact, at one point I ran the Health Department here in the County for about 19 years.

I retired and found out that being retired at 60-something was just not any fun so I went back to work. And I just work at the Burlington Chamber, and I'm really glad to be here because I love working with both Lisa and with Ron. They're both very thoughtful. It's been very good. I feel like I know all of you because I've watched six of the Planning Commission meetings and they're long, and I got a feeling for how much time you put in to these meetings. Martha, it was really good to hear why you're here in Skagit County. I love that. Mark, we've had some good conversations. I'm sad to hear you go. We've had some very good conversations. You think well. I appreciate it. Joseph, it's nice to have youth. It's great to have young people and it was real exciting to see when I first saw you some nice young people coming on in the Planning Commission. Joe, yes, BYK rocks. It's the best. I love talking to your son and they do just great work in this community. I really appreciate it. And I live right across the lake from you so sometimes when I'm out making noise that's been me shooting my pellet gun at the beavers who keep digging all my property away. And Tim, I've known Tim for many, many years. I'm really glad that he's running this. He's very, very thoughtful. So this is a really, really excellent group, and I know you put a lot of time into this. This is a tremendous commitment, and when I hear that sometimes you spend multiple days in a row, that's tough. I imagine, especially long meetings late at night. At the same time, I appreciate that you're really committed to our community. It takes people to be committed to this community to keep it together. A couple times a few of you have talked about maintaining farmland and making sure that we don't lose farmland or forests. Kathy, I agree with you 100%. We can't lose forests to growth. But we will have growth, just like Commissioner Wesen told you, so we just have to be – and so we rely on you being thoughtful and help us think through the growing process.

I'm sorry about COVID. It's really made your meetings very difficult. I think it's changed the tone of your meetings. There's no ability to see body language, no ability to do eye contact, no ability to feel like you're actually connected to each other. This should come back fairly quickly. I hope – we expect that the bulk of us will be immunized by early June, at the very latest early July, and then we can all start getting back into meetings and start doing some really good – have some great discussions.

Your contribution to the Comp Plan is huge. Development regulations, they're shaping the future of our community, and I know you know this but a lot of people don't. You guys have a tremendous amount of impact on the way this community will look 20 years from now, 50 years from now, and it can't be undersold at all. It's so essential and so important.

The Shoreline stuff you're going to be working on, I really appreciate all the work that you put in and *will* be putting into that because that is really meaningful. Again, we have mountains but we have water.

And so the agritourism, I think, is a great opportunity and it'll be really good to see how that goes through your process.

The Comp Plan amendments, all of that I'll be watching you at each – like Commissioner Wesen, I will be watching you each meeting and seeing how this goes. It's very fascinating to me and I love to see the conversations.

So given all that, I'm the new guy. I know the least, and I will be tapping on some of your shoulders just to talk to me about how you see the growth process go and just how you see this work so

that over time we will make very good decisions and maintain a very, very good community. So thank you for letting us join you today and thanks for letting me be part of this planning – the bigger part of the planning process in this community. So thank you.

Chair Janicki: Thank you, Commissioner Browning. So I'm Lisa Janicki and, you know, I think about what shapes my way of thinking. I grew up in – I was born in Fairbanks, Alaska. My parents' divorce – since I was the oldest child, and at the age of 11 years old was writing all the – paying all the bills for my mom and then waiting for child support checks to come in. And I only say that because you think of what things kind of formed my way of thinking. You know, when I got married into this Janicki family my job was to write all the checks and wait for the money to come in while all those engineers in the logging side and the manufacturing side were out spending money and buying things and, you know, hiring people. And it was my only job is to make sure there was enough money in the bank. So pretty much my whole life has been about, Is there enough money in the bank? And to do the things that make a difference for the long run, what are the good ideas that are worth funding? And so when I ran for public office, it was really the same thing. It was so many levels of government, they aren't able to or don't have the background to look beyond a biennium – an election cycle or a two-year budgeting process. And how is it that you plan – you know, when we're doing these Comp Plans that are supposed to last, you know, for decades, how is it that we only plan one or two years at a time financially? And that was really what drove me to run for office. How do we accomplish long term goals when we're only thinking short term money?

So, you know, with that being said, I have to say just listening to all the introductions tonight the cumulative body of knowledge that is here on this virtual meeting of the Planning Commission, I'm really impressed and it gives me a lot of hope as a County. All the Counties are kind of looking at the legislature this year because so much is happening down there that will affect the very work that we're doing in the Counties and on the Planning Commission and in our Planning and Development Services. I don't know what all you are aware of, but, you know, as a for-example Representative Lekanoff has proposed and it has passed in the House a bill that would add – they call it the “salmon bill,” and the title says it will aid in recovery of salmon through our comprehensive plan. And what it really does is it requires a net ecological gain on any building project private or public. And, you know, the first reaction is, How can that – you know, how could that possibly happen? But it just passed the House, like, with two-thirds of a yes vote. So, you know, if it passes the Senate, it isn't a matter of *if* it will happen. It's, How do we advocate for something like that to best serve the needs? I mean, salmon recovery is a great goal, but how that is actually accomplished and what does that mean for modifying our Comp Plan for any aspect of salmon recovery? I think that, you know, there's a lot of – you know, there's a lot of game time that has to play out before we would have an answer for that. And I think about that because that work load comes into the Planning and Development Department and, by extension, into the Planning Commission, you know, to look at some really big issues.

There are other GMA amendments that the legislature is looking at. Some of it just has to do with frequency of updates, but in some of those frequency of updates there have been the proposals that, for example, we were talking – I mean, talking about densifying and housing, but, you know, actually forcing counties and any jurisdiction that has a comp plan to actually show the effectiveness of their comp plans – you know, those metrics – and what have they done to achieve the things that they say they're going to do within the comp plan. So not just have a plan against which we measure our land use policies, but what did it actually accomplish.

You know, and those are big – they're both big ticket issues. They're going to cost money. But they're that long range kind of planning that is so incumbent upon all of us to do in order to

accomplish the things that we talked about in this meeting during introductions, which is, you know, we love being able to go from the mountains to the ocean. We love the forest. Believe me, I'm married to a logger, for those of you who don't know, and that logger spent 10 years on the Nature Conservancy board and so he's a conflicted logger. That's what I – that's what I tell the industry folks. Not so much that, but that, you know, that is a sincere – you know, how do you conserve or how do you keep a viable forest industry for the future? And that comes back around to that land use policy. But the forest industry in particular was hit early and was hit hard with the requirements for – under the Clean Waters and our habitat conservation plan within the state of protecting, buffering the streams – you know, 200 feet on each side is a lot of, you know, land, is a lot of timber, is a lot of acreage to commit to habitat.

And so – but it's those kind of steps, it's that kind of long term thinking and we all have, you know, a place and a way to make sure that those grandchildren – you know, I agree, Mark, with you. Grandchildren are the best. It's the reason we can do what we do is because – it's like a do-over. Mike used to call it a mulligan. He needed a mulligan in golf. I never really got that until I got a grandchild and then realized it's my ultimate do-over. Because you can't do anything wrong with a grandchild but it makes the work that we're doing now, you know, even that much more vital that they have those same opportunities or better opportunities for, you know, the really clean water, the really great place to work, being able to farm or whatever the choice is for – you know, from our shopkeepers and our industry folks and gravel pits too. We need the gravel in this county to make this work. But it all comes around to these land use decisions that really is starting with the body of work that the Planning Commission does.

And so I guess I – the underlying purpose for this is that we could have a little bit – you know, that we could talk a little bit but that from the Commissioners to you our doors are open. I would like to formalize, and I'm going to ask Chair Raschko and all of you to figure out what would be the best times or best part of the year for the Board of Commissioners and Planning Commission to meet. And I think we should formalize, like, twice a year at least to get these two bodies together so that we get that opportunity to hear from you directly, to thank you for your work, and that you can hear from us and understand what it is that is the priorities of the Board of Commissioners – you know, whoever those Commissioners are at the time.

I will leave it at that, and if there are questions – I don't know. Tim, do you want to recognize people if there's questions for any of the three of us?

Chair Raschko: Sure, Commissioner. First of all, I'd just like to say that I agree with you that meeting twice a year at least would be very good for all of us, and I look forward to doing that. So we will take your admonition and try to come up with what would be the best time for everybody to attempt to do that.

So do any of the Planning Commission members have questions for any of the County Commissioners? Commissioner Mitchell.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you. I've got 86,000 questions but I'll just get to two for you guys! Some key things come to mind. I would love to know how you guys decide how to docket something. I realize that some things come from staff and some things come from the public. That's the simple part. The big question is: How do you really pick something to go on the docket, because that's a lot of time and effort by everybody that goes into it? And the second thing, I'd like to know what you guys are hearing locally, regionally, and statewide about agritourism.

Chair Janicki: Commissioner Wesen, I see you laughing. So why don't you – which one of those two would you like to tackle?

Commissioner Wesen: On the docketing one. We'll start that one first. So I don't know if everybody understands the process, but anybody can put in a potential docketing the last business day of July. And the Planning Department looks at that and decides basically how much time they can spend on it and then they bring ___ County Commissioners, and then the County Commissioners say yes or no, we will work on that for the next year, year-and-a-half. And one of the things is just flat out how much time is available. How much time does the Planning Department have? What their staffing level is. So that's one of the main things that I look at in deciding on what is docketed.

The other thing is the things that are required by state law we're going to go through and do that. One of the things with the flood insurance program, there were some – those flood issues we had to take care of because of state law. So those are the things I look at there.

The ag tourism, there's a lot of different choices that can be made on ag tourism. I think that's one area that is definitely going to be a growth industry in the area. There's a lot of areas across the country how they're doing it. And, you know, I've travelled a little bit enough to look at the different things that are happening, and one of the things we've done in Skagit County is we've restricted pretty heavily what type of businesses are allowed to be permitted in our agriculture zone. And so the question is, you know, some of them were grandfathered in because they were here, but is that a good thing or bad thing? Should we allow – open the doors and let everybody come in and do the same thing and then maybe they would go out of business because there'd be too much availability for them. And then what do we do with a structure that is built when it's only used for agriculture or tourism? And so that's things we've got to balance back and forth. We've got to look at what the public wants to have, what the property owners want to have, and what we want to envision the whole county to look like in the future. So those are a couple of my thoughts on Kathy's questions.

Chair Janicki: Just because of time, maybe we'll just jump to another question and, Peter, I could pick that up. Is there another question out there?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Nobody has a question?

Chair Janicki: Well, you know – go ahead, Kathy, if you've got another one is no one else is asking.

Commissioner Mitchell: I was going to say if somebody else doesn't have something on the different topics, I would like to see what each of you, Lisa and Peter, think about those other areas as well. I guess I'm mostly asking because I'd like to know about the mental processes when you go through and you choose things. You do so many things both locally, regionally, and nationally – you go to a lot of national meetings too – how you're picking things for us to work on, I think, is a very interesting question, so I'd like to know the process for you guys, too, if there's time.

Chair Janicki: Yeah. You know, we're in the process of drafting the work program with the Department right now, and, you know, that becomes the body of work that the Commission often ends up looking at. And some of it is regulatory – things that we *have* to do – but agritourism really was born from a number of requests from various – you know, a small tea grower on a little parcel

of land east of Sedro-Woolley who's trying to run, you know, tea parties out in the English gardens there but can't do that legally because that's Ag-NRL. You know, or people who have, you know, a cheese-making place in Bow who really – their best sales is to be able to offer people the ability to eat or taste – you know, it goes a little beyond just tasting things, so you can sell and, you know, provide food and beverage. And I think that fine line that I hear from, you know, a number of ___, you know, where it just isn't enough. You know, I think of, you know, Perkins' Apple Farm and – a 40-acre farm out there. One acre at a time they started ripping out the apple orchards, you know, because it just wasn't viable anymore. The industry overall wasn't supported. And although they planted, you know, vines there – grapes there – it isn't – without having the financial support of selling wine, it isn't viable. And so how do we balance that? You know, that's really the thing. The tremendous amount of visitors that our county gets for the Family Farm weekend in October is just kind of indicative of how people really feel connected to the source of their food. And, you know, Skagit County, if we do it right, is positioned to balance that interest and support. And, Kathy, part of it is I think of those, you know, the very – the people visiting from Seattle who come up and want to see where their food comes from – and we now have that Genuine Skagit Valley brand – are the ones we also need to convince that agriculture needs water in the right place at the right time and, you know, not just when it's, you know, convenient. We need water in those ag fields all year round or those Whole Foods shoppers aren't going to have that kind of connection to their ground. So agritourism is a really big topic and I think it was just a matter of hearing from it from so many different places. So that's how it ends up on the docket for consideration.

Commissioner Browning, I know this is all kind of – many new things, but do you have something you'd like to share there?

Commissioner Browning: Just very quickly, and you're right: This is all pretty new to me, but I also spent a lot of years around agriculture and I see that agriculture – just growing things – isn't going to make money in this community. It's growing it, producing it, promoting it – all of those things. And that's – you know, when you look at, for example, our Cairnspring Mills or the Fairhaven Organic Grains, those are fantastic, fantastic flours that come out of there but people have to try them to know the differences in really top quality flour. And you've got a place like King Arthur's Mills that are having – or a Fairhaven Organic Grains come up with the only whole wheat pastry flour on the market and it's just so spectacular, that's the kind of stuff that makes Skagit really stand out. All of our breweries. We've got some really outstanding breweries here in town but people won't find out about it unless we create a mechanism that gets people out off I-5 and out into the valley and trying a few different beers. The second level of going beyond just growing stuff, but actually promoting it, actually producing it – that's where we start getting really, really good money out of our farms. And it goes back to when Mark and I were young and there were pea farms all over the valley, that we would grow it, we'd produce it, we'd sell it. And those were very profitable. The minute they stopped canning and freezing peas it made peas very, very meaningless in the big picture of making money. So that's part of agritourism. It's not only helping us sell things like the really good cheeses that Roger makes over at Skagit Cheese, but it also helps us promote some of the other products that otherwise would be out in the Port being produced or dealt with but would never get to see the light of day from a consumer standpoint. So anyway, there's a very long-winded short response, so thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Lundsten has a question, I believe.

Commissioner Lundsten: I do. Thank you. I'd like to suggest that for a joint meeting we arrange to do it after the Planning Commission has voted on the docket and before it comes to a vote with the Board just so that those issues can be ventilated in public. You know, that we can have face-

to-face meeting about particular issues. When there's a long laundry list of this issue and that issue there are some fine points that may get glossed over that in a person-to-person meeting we could go over it, and if it became a ritual it would be a – just provide that much more transparency for everyone. And I'd also just like to take this occasion to thank the three of you for joining this meeting and that I appreciate it and I hope it does turn into a regular thing. I'm encouraged that it will. Thanks.

Chair Janicki: Thank you, Mark.

Chair Raschko: Okay, are there more questions?

Chair Janicki: All right – oh.

Chair Raschko: Go ahead, Commissioner Janicki. I'm sorry.

Chair Janicki: No, not so much that. I was just going to – I think the only thanks that I perhaps ___ in thanking the staff from Planning and Development. Director Hal Hart, and Peter Gill, your leadership. Is Mike still on this call? Anyway, I thought I saw Mike Cerbone earlier. And, you know, Betsy, your long term commitment to these big – when we talk about big planning projects, usually Betsy Stevenson has had a hand in guiding those through the County process. And so I do want to thank the staff. But, you know, although you work closely with the staff, we are here too and if there's any message to take away from tonight is, you know, feel free to reach out to us. We don't want to vent every disagreement that perhaps happens in the Commission, but, you know, I want to make sure that you feel supported, that you stay inspired, and that you're able to share this really great wealth of knowledge that you all represent with the county in the broadest sense. You know, our future generations, some not yet even arrived.

All right. With that, we are going to adjourn the Board of County Commissioners at 6:59 p.m. Good evening to all of you. And, Tim, I'll work with you with staff to get those calendar dates for future meetings. Okay?

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Commissioner Janicki, and thank all three Commissioners for having this meeting and for all of your great input and shows of sense of appreciation. So thank you very much and have a good night.

Chair Janicki: You're welcome. Good night.

Chair Raschko: Okay, with that we will reconvene the meeting of the Skagit County Planning Commission, and we will also recess the meeting for a five-minute break, if anybody would appreciate that. So we'll be back at 7:05 sharp. Thank you.

(break)

Mr. Gill: So with that, I'll turn it over to Betsy and Dan.

Dan Nickel: Great. Thanks, Peter. This is Dan Nickel again from the Watershed Company. So greetings. I'm happy to be back in front of you all. I'm going to continue – tonight's, you know, meeting is a continuation of the past few meetings that we've been having to talk about the Shoreline Master Program and essentially bring you all up to speed on the changes that have taken place since 2016, which is the last time the Planning Commission worked on the comprehensive update of the Shoreline Master Program and made a recommendation to the

Board. So I'm going to share my screen. I've got another PowerPoint presentation here. Okay, and I guess to start with this is actually the last meeting in a series of meetings we've been having that focuses on these changes, and so – and tonight's meeting is actually – there's probably less material tonight than there has been in previous evenings so I'm hoping, you know, we have plenty of opportunity to answer any additional questions that you might have or clarifications, and I'm happy to do that at the end of the presentation.

So this is essentially the outline for tonight. It follows these few remaining sections. We want to talk about Part VI of the Shoreline Master Program, which is the section on Legally Established Pre-Existing Uses and Structures, sometimes referred to as nonconforming uses and structures. We specifically want to talk a bit about the residences and appurtenant structures there. And then we'll move into the Administration piece, which is Part VII of the Shoreline Master Program. A few sections here on Applications, Shoreline Permits, and Exemptions. And then we also have a few clarifications under Definitions under Part VIII. And then lastly we have a few items to talk about under the Shoreline Environment Designation mapping. Shoreline Environment Designations are covered under Part II of the Shoreline Master Program but there's a separate map component that we'll talk about several issues there. So just a recap of really what's been happening and what our current status is. I'll have a few slides here to talk about kind of what's been going on and our current calendar.

So we have been meeting with County staff and the Department of Ecology representatives. We've been meeting weekly to talk about, you know, their early review of the Shoreline Master Program and to get their feedback. Again, this is a joint process. You know, not only does the County need to go through and prepare these comprehensive and periodic updates to the Master Program and adopt it, but Ecology is a – also has to approve of this and will go through their own approval process. So it's – you know, implementation of the Shoreline Master Program has a dual purpose. So we need to be coordinated with Ecology and get their feedback. If we get it early enough, like we're doing, that'll help us really kind of clean things up and make sure that we're consistent with state law, and that's really the intent here. Then we'll bring those, you know, through the public process here later on.

We continue to have monthly project updates. Many of you have attended those or have heard about these. These are virtual monthly meetings we've been having with stakeholders and interested parties. The next one is actually being held this Thursday and we'll have some more information on that. So that's just a way for us to, you know, again provide members of the public with some information about the status of things and what to look forward to and what this is all about.

We mentioned before, you know, the next stage of this is going to move into the public process, a public comment period. And, you know, early when we started this back in January we had hoped to start the public review process a bit earlier. With our coordination with Ecology, we're finding that it's best for us to maybe push that out just a little bit. And so we're hoping to start a public comment period hopefully by the end of March. That's our goal. It might move into the beginning of April. But we're really looking to having a Planning Commission public hearing in April. And the public comment period is likely to run for about 45 days. So we've been adjusting this schedule. Here's a bit more detail just highlighting this public comment period in the middle here. And that might shift a little bit but we're trying to keep this schedule so that we can get through and adopt, you know, ideally by the end of June, which is the end of the state grant funding period, but we recognize that there's – you know, there still is a state review process at the end of this. Once the County adopts the Shoreline Master Program it has to be sent to the Department of Ecology for their formal review, and that process is likely to occur later this summer.

And again, you know, the public involvement piece – there's many opportunities. You guys have seen this slide before. We really want to point people to, you know, our online products. We have not only the County website that hosts, you know, a lot of the documentation – the background information – but we also have an online open house that is active. And that will again – the online open house will become a mechanism for folks to supply public comment as we move forward into the public comment period. So the more people we can get to that site and get familiar with the site, the better. There's certain log in information to become more involved, to sign up for these monthly project meetings; this next one on Thursday, there's a sign-up for that and to subscribe for email updates and notifications. So I'd encourage, if you haven't – I'd encourage members of the Commission as well as the public to please go to that site and subscribe.

Okay, and then – so tonight I mentioned what we're going to be reviewing tonight. And then we have another meeting scheduled on March 23rd. I guess the topics there, since we have covered what we want to cover, it's almost an opportunity to kind of revisit open questions that you might have and discuss any outliers. So we'll kind of come back to this at the end of this presentation and revisit that, but we do want to give you an opportunity to be able to ask questions, and hopefully we can provide clarity.

Okay, and then lastly I think before I jump into the substance of tonight, this is just an outline. You guys have seen the actual draft of the Shoreline Master Program in your packet. You should have that both in a PDF format. It's separated out into these eight different parts and the first being, you know, the Authority, Purpose, and Jurisdiction, and then Part II, which we'll dive into a little bit in the Mapping piece – but Part II is the Shoreline Environment Designation section, which describes, you know, really the management policies and the criteria establishing for creating those designations. And then Part III dives into the general regulations that really pertain to all uses and development in our shoreline areas, whereas Part IV really dives into more of the minute details specific to specific shoreline uses and modifications. Part V gives reference to Critical Areas, which again we need to regulate critical areas and critical area buffers that occur within shoreline jurisdiction. We need to regulate those through the Shoreline Master Program so we have to – instead of the CAOs. We have to pay particular attention there. And then the last three sections, which I mentioned earlier, we're going to discuss in a bit more detail tonight.

So okay, the first section, this Part VI on Legally Established Pre-Existing Uses and Structures, this section of the Shoreline Master Program – and again, I'm just going to hit on a few things that have occurred since the 2016 draft, which was previously reviewed by the Planning Commission in 2016 and made a recommendation to the Board. At that time, the Planning Commission made some recommendations in the recorded motion and this was one of these areas. So in section 14.26.620, which is the Pre-Existing Single-Family Residences and Appurtenant Structures, and that's actually on page 152 of your draft. Subsection (3)(a), which deals with minor enlargements or expansions, the Planning Commission in 2016 made a recommendation to essentially combine subsections (iii) and (iv). Specifically they deal with enlargements, and what it does is it allows for height expansions. And so if your structure – it allows for a structure's height to be increased as long as it doesn't exceed the threshold, or if it's already – or in the case of an existing over-height structure, the enlargement does not increase the structure's existing height. It's just bringing that into a bit more clarity in terms of when you can increase the height of an existing structure, or if the structure's already nonconforming to those provisions, when it can expand. Any questions on that piece? Again, that's kind of a clarification. Those two pieces were already in the document. We're combining those based on the direction of the Planning Commission.

The next few sections are in Part VII under Administration. This first area is under Applications. This is code section 14.26.710. It's on page 158 of the Planning Commission review draft. And this is in subsection (2) under Application level. And these are actually clarifications that were added per County staff, and this really stems from the initial attempt, really, or initial idea to update the Skagit County Code 14.06, Permit Procedures. That has not been done yet and so we want to make sure that these clarifications are actually in the Shoreline Master Program here since 14.06 has not yet been updated. And what it does is these specific (a) through (e) have been added to the draft. So we identify shoreline exemptions – are actually a type of Level I application and a Notice of Development Application is not required for these shoreline exemptions. (b) would be for shoreline substantial development permits, which would be a type of Level I application. And again, noticing there would be consistent with WAC 173-27-110. (c) identifies conditional use permits to be a type of Level II application. And a notice there again is consistent with WAC 173-27-110. In this case, a public hearing is required. And (d) and (e) both are variances but (d) we identified as an administrative variance, which would be a type of Level I application. Again, this is a notice consistent with WAC 173-27-110. Whereas (e) is a Hearing Examiner variance, which would be a type of Level II application. And here again, this would be where a public hearing would be required. So we wanted to specifically make those clear in the code. Essentially when 14.06 does get updated these will be included there.

The next area under Administration was for Shoreline Permits. This is code section 14.26.715 on page 159 of the review draft. And this was under subsection (1) when a permit is required. This subsection was actually added based on County staff and consultants for clarity for when a shoreline permit review is required, and it specifically actually points to the following subsection, which is subsection (720). For exemptions and development not required to obtain shoreline permits or local review. And this is part of our legislative review that came through the periodic update. As you recall, you know, this is not just a comprehensive update of the Shoreline Master Program, but we are also conducting a periodic review, which is required under the state law. And part of that periodic review is to make sure that we're consistent with any legislative updates which have occurred, and one of these things is to provide clarity for when a shoreline permit is or is not actually required or even does not apply under the act. And I'll move to the next slide because it actually provides this clarity. So the next one here again is in subsection (720). This is on page 159 of the review draft. So not only did we revise the section title – you'll note that we've revised the section title to include not just exemptions, which is what it was titled earlier, but it also addresses when shoreline permits or the local review under the Shoreline Program is not required. So subsection (5) here is again for consistency with WAC 173-27-044. This is for developments that are not required to obtain shoreline permits or local review. An example of this is for WSDOT facility maintenance and safety improvements. The state has identified these as not needing to obtain shoreline permits. And in subsection (6), again for consistency with WAC – this time for WAC 173-27-045. This is actually for developments not subject to the Shoreline Management Act. So this is for clarity's sake under Administration.

Moving on to Definitions. There's a few definitions here. This is under Part VIII of the Shoreline Master Program. Agricultural – so one of these was under several definitions: for “agricultural activities,” agricultural land,” and “agricultural products.” This is in section 14.26.820, so pages 170 and 171 of the review draft. These definitions again were modified for consistency with the Washington Administrative Code section 173-26-020, and so these are definitions that, you know, really one the Department of Ecology is very strong in making sure that we are consistent with the state requirements. And then the last one here is – the second one here is for development. The definition of “development” was modified per the legislative update in 2017. I guess per that legislative update they allowed the definition for “development” to specifically not include the dismantling of structures. And so, you know, I guess this picture, this image here is a good

example of this. So this marine rail line, which can be a common use but sometimes they get pulled out for whatever reason. If that – for example, if that structure were to be removed from the shoreline, if no other development is taking place and it's just the removal of that structure, it is not defined as development and therefore would be able to be removed without shoreline review – or without a shoreline permit.

Two more definitions here that again we're – the first one here, the definition for a "floating home." This is on page 173 of the review draft. This was modified based on a 2011 legislative update that specifically identifies that a floating home is not a vessel. So it's not to be used for movement.

And then the last one is for "floodway." The definition – this is on page 174 of your review draft, and this was a modification per County staff, again for consistency with the FEMA definition. The prior version had essentially two ways to go about the floodway designation and that one was the FEMA definition but also a definition based on the conditions of the land. And so because the FEMA floodway is used throughout the county, we've gone with that specific definition. Ecology doesn't want to see two definitions in there either.

And the last section here is under Shoreline Environment Designations. This again is covered under Part II of the SMP, but the mapping component is tied to the Shoreline Master Program but it's available – the map itself is available separately. The current proposed map is actually from 2016 and is located – there's a web address. This is posted on the County's Shoreline Master Program page.

There were a couple of items that the Planning Commission in 2016 made recommendations to. And so the first one here is on Guemes Island. There were five changes to the designation map that were made on Guemes Island to revert back to the current designation. So part of our review of shoreline environment designations is part of the comprehensive update that all took prior to 2016. We took a look at the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization report that essentially looked at ecological conditions along all shoreline areas. It also looked at land use, existing and future land use. And we took a close look at all these areas of the – throughout the county and, you know, looked at the existing designations and in a few areas we proposed changes to these designations based on these conditions – ecological conditions as well as land use conditions. And as part of that effort we came up with a map for Guemes Island where there *were* some changes that were proposed. And so the 2016 Planning Commission took a look at that, accepted some of these, but they did make some recommendations to go back. And these five changes – I've zoomed in here so you can see these, and there's a table on the left side here. This table here corresponds to the recommendations from the Planning Commission and the map on the right shows the location of these corresponding numbers. So for number 1, which corresponds to the area in red, the red square in the upper section here, their recommendation was to change this area from Rural Conservancy back to Shoreline Residential. And so you'll see here where this number 1 is located: the area in yellow inside this red box. The area in yellow is under this legend here is proposed for Rural Conservancy. And that's proposed. And so based on the 2016 Planning Commission recommendation was to change it back to Shoreline Residential, so this essentially would become this pink color under Shoreline Residential.

Similarly under item number four, or area number four, the recommendation from the Planning Commission was to change this area down here from Rural Conservancy to Natural. It's important to note we're not talking about this entire stretch along the shoreline. It is just the area adjacent to this number that would be changed back to Natural. So it corresponds. This area in green above the red square is Natural and so it'd extend Natural down a little farther to what it was before. Or I should say what it is currently.

Area six on the south end here, the recommendation was to change this area from Shoreline Residential back to Rural Conservancy. And so there's – again the area to the right is already in Rural Conservancy and so that would be extended in the area adjacent to the number 6.

And then number eight here on the west shore, this area here was proposed to be Shoreline Residential. The recommendation was to change that back to Rural Conservancy, and so the stretch here both to the north and to the south of the red square, there's an area in here that's Shoreline Residential and that would be changed back to Rural Conservancy.

And then the last item here very similar to what we've done here in number eight but it's actually the reverse, it would change this area from Rural Conservancy back to Natural and not Rural Conservancy. So this – again, these edits to the designation map are reverting back to what they currently are.

A couple other further changes here: So Judy Reservoir – this is actually a snapshot, both an aerial image from the PUD – actually from their website – and then this is just a snapshot of the Shoreline Environment Designation map of the Judy Reservoir area which, you know, was currently proposed for a Rural Conservancy designation. But actually Judy Reservoir is proposed actually for removal from shoreline jurisdiction and it's, you know, it's essentially something that Department of Ecology has supported. They've written a letter of acceptance to this to support the removal of Judy Reservoir from shoreline jurisdiction, and so that will be removed from our maps.

And then another area under the shoreline environment designations is related to the Skagit River Rural Conservancy Skagit Floodway designation. Currently there's a designation that runs all the way from the State Route 9 bridge all the way upstream to the confluence with the Skagit and the Sauk Rivers. This is a designation that's actually shown in the light blue color here that identifies essentially the Skagit River floodway. So that entire stretch of the Skagit River in the floodway has been given the specific designation to really call out the importance of the floodway in this area. And I bring this up because the 2016 Planning Commission actually made a recommendation in their recorded motion to extend the Skagit River Rural – I'm sorry; the Rural Conservancy Skagit Floodway designation upstream on the Sauk River, as well as the Upper Skagit River. And so this is a – this is actually a snapshot here from the Shoreline Inventory that was completed that shows the area in green. This is the – I believe. I'm pretty sure this is the Skagit River floodway. And so you'll see here this is the Sauk River and then the Upper Skagit and you can see, you know, the extent of the floodway mapping that would be included here. So we have not made this change. You know, County staff is actually concerned about the accuracy of the floodway mapping up along the Sauk River. This is a very dynamic system, as you know, and it changes all the time, and there's areas that we believe that the floodway mapping is not accurate. And so there's concern that if we were to make this map change we would be faced with inaccuracies, rather than the current designation in most of this area is Rural Conservancy. And so right now, you know, we haven't made this change. You know, we need further review and discussion of this matter before we move forward. We'll come back to this because I would like some feedback.

One other area, before I end, is actually on another 2016 Planning Commission recommendation – was to add definitions in Part VIII, which is the Definitions section, for each of the shoreline environment designations, and that would include cross-reference to Part II of the SMP, which includes those. This has not been done. This really adds a level of redundancy and it's a possibility for future inconsistency if we were to do this, and so, you know, we and County staff are not recommending this change at this point in time. You know, the shoreline environment designation

purpose statements, the designation criteria, and the management policies, they're already included in Section 6B of the SMP and, you know, those don't need repetition and potential for inaccuracies if they were to be included in the Definitions section.

So that concludes what I wanted to present on. I maybe pause there. I do want to talk about the upcoming Planning Commission on the 23rd and what topics we might want to bring forward, but are there any questions or comments related to any of the materials that I've presented so far?

Chair Raschko: Are there any questions from the Commission? Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: Yes, when you're talking about removal of structures or things from the shoreline wouldn't require a shoreline permit – I understood that correctly, right? If they weren't going to be put back.

Mr. Nickel: Correct.

Commissioner Rose: So would they require *any* permit?

Mr. Nickel: They would not require a substantial development permit, and that, you know, if it's only removal. I mean, if there's any other action – this is where it becomes kind of a – you know, you have to think about kind of what the action would be. If there's going to be excavation, for instance, that would constitute development. If it's simply removal and nothing else, then it would not require that review, but if anything else takes place that may trigger shoreline review so it's –

Commissioner Rose: So I'm not normally advocating more permits, but having worked in the Seattle building department for four years, my understanding of one requirement for permits to demolish things is just simply to keep track of what's getting taken out. And so I'm just curious about that if – how do you – and I don't know if you're talking, like, a whole building going away. You show that set of rails going away. But I don't know how you could get out of there without a machine. But at any rate, is that one of the purposes of a permit when you're taking things away – to simply keep track for the record of what's out there?

Mr. Nickel: I would think that certainly is an advantage of keeping track, yes. And I think from a – this kind of goes to a no net loss evaluation, is that I think it's important to keep track of those things because that ultimately could help the County in the future if you are aware of what has been removed from shoreline jurisdiction as a means to kind of assess the overall impact over time on shoreline ecological functions. So that could be important for the County to track from a no net loss calculation standpoint.

Ms. Stevenson: Hey, Dan?

Mr. Nickel: Yes?

Ms. Stevenson: Sorry. It's Betsy. Could you – if your PowerPoint is done, could you take it down so we can see everybody and they can see each other, please?

Mr. Nickel: I sure can.

Ms. Stevenson: And, Martha, I think that's a really good point and I'll let Dan finish his response, but we would probably require a demolition permit, not through the Shoreline Program but just through the building program, and I think what makes sense to me to do exactly what you're

saying and get credit for that if it's a building going away and be able to say, Hey, yeah, we removed – you know, we didn't but the County did. This many structures were removed out of the shoreline area – is to have something in there: Hey, is your property within shoreline jurisdiction? And then we would be able to capture that data if we added that, so that's a really, really good point. Thank you.

Commissioner Rose: I have one more comment on that. Similar topic, but I can't remember how you worded it. So you talked about improving the salmon habitat with every action, or something like that. Can you say it again so I have a better – because I have a thought about that. Do you understand what I'm asking?

Mr. Nickel: Yeah.

Ms. Stevenson: Was that from the discussion earlier about the legislation, the proposed legislation?

Commissioner Rose: Yes. Yes, it was.

Ms. Stevenson: For net benefit on any kind of development? Yeah. That goes beyond the shoreline stuff.

Commissioner Rose: Oh, I see. Yeah.

Ms. Stevenson: We've had that proposed legislation come through at least the last year, if not the last couple of years. But what they are proposing that we look for is you don't have to just mitigate one-per-one or like-for-like. It's going to have to be an actual benefit and not just mitigation for the impact. And I haven't read the legislation this time to know exactly what they're asking for or whether that's all been developed, or that's something that's going to come later if the legislation passes.

Commissioner Rose: So everything that I've been – well, not everything but let's say in the last at least 10 years with the push for low impact development, which I thought was mandatory now – or maybe it's mandatory if feasible. I can't remember how it's worded. But that goes a long way towards satisfying that requirement. And, I mean, whether it be on a shoreline project or a project in the middle of a town, because all that stormwater is what's the problem. That's the main problem. And I don't know why they don't – and maybe they've been discussing it, but do they ever discuss going after existing properties? I know I talked to – is it Maya, the former head of Ecology, or is it Mia? How do you say her name? She's not there anymore.

Ms. Stevenson: It was Maya ____. Yeah.

Commissioner Rose: Maya. I had this conversation with her because back in the '80s – and it turns out it was her program – Ecology came up with a program that mandated the removal of all the underground tanks on commercial properties, and they gave all those property owners 10 years to accomplish that. They said, We don't care if you do it tomorrow or nine years and nine months from now, but you've got to do it before 10 years is up. And I don't know the details of how they enforced it or if they offered incentives or, you know, monetary help or tax write-offs or whatever. But I said to Maya, Why can't a similar program be put together for existing properties where they have lots of hard surface or haven't dealt with their stormwater at all? Because the main problem is with existing properties, not new construction. And she thought that was actually a good idea. But at any rate, I just wanted to throw that out there because most of the – at least

from an urban perspective – most of the pollution in the Sound is coming from existing urban properties, both residential and industrial and commercial. And people don't even realize that residential properties accounts for about 45% of it. So at any rate, I'm just throwing that out there because we always try to fix all the problems with new construction, new projects, when, in fact, most of the problems that are existing stem from those existing properties that were built before any regulations were required.

So at any rate, I don't – you don't need to answer it or anything if you don't want, but I just think that people need to be aware of that and that the County should figure out a way to somehow go after these existing properties either with incentives – give people incentives or a little tax write-off, or lower their stormwater portion of their property tax bill or whatever, but somehow figure it out that way.

I'm done.

Ms. Stevenson: Those are great comments. No, I appreciate it very much.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Yes, thank you. Dan or Betsy, I hope I didn't miss it – when are we going to hit Section 5 on the critical areas?

Mr. Nickel: Well, we talked about critical areas integration in the first meeting we had in late January. It is one of the things we are talking with the Department of Ecology about in terms of just how we integrate our existing – you know, the existing critical areas ordinance. So that's been a piece that we are working with them on. A lot of that has to do with just the semantics of how it works as opposed to the – you know, we're not talking about changing buffers or things like that. We're talking about just kind of how do we take the critical areas ordinance and integrate it? I mean, do we – there're several choices. One is to, you know, put it in as an appendix. We can just reference it via an ordinance. But really the integration of the critical areas ordinance is making the most sense. It does mean that we will be likely bringing in those current regulations into the Shoreline Master Program, and essentially that's going to benefit for clarity's sake. So do you have one go-to location for that information, as opposed to trying to go and reference the critical areas ordinance somewhere else, if you have to get a shoreline permit? So that's what we're currently working on, you know, to try to get that integration done. But essentially what we brought to you in the end of January, I believe, that talked about the changes to the critical areas regulations were what we're sticking with in terms of the – you know, any changes to the existing language.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you.

Mr. Nickel: Betsy, do you have anything to add there?

Ms. Stevenson: Yeah, I guess the only thing I would say is that we may have to update a little bit of information that comes over into the Shoreline Program so that it aligns with the state guidelines and laws now. I think the one table is going to have to be tweaked because we haven't done that in our code yet – as far as the intensity of uses and things, Dan? The one number is going to have to at least change.

Mr. Nickel: Yes.

Ms. Stevenson: And we have talked to Ecology. There may be a couple other things like that. That's the only one I remember from our discussion. But they've given us some more details so there may be something else like that but nothing in the way of buffer, changes in the buffers, or anything like that. They will still remain consistent with that's in our existing critical areas ordinance. So we will definitely highlight anything that we bring over that has some sort of a change in it to get it updated to current state requirements as it comes into the Shoreline Program so that you will see those and we'll make sure that you know that that's what it is. But mostly we're just going to bring the sections out of the existing critical areas ordinance that we need to have in our Shoreline Program and it'll be basically word for word except those areas maybe ___ the one thing that I mentioned and then anything else that Ecology indicates needs to change in order to comply with any new state guidelines. And some of it they did say, Nope, you can do that when you update your critical areas ordinance. We're not going to worry about that for the shoreline stuff. So we don't have good answers for you right now but we should soon.

Commissioner Mitchell: Okay, so from a practical standpoint then, for what we're looking at on the draft right now, if you go to page 148 and 49 and you see some of those gray areas where you've got a few comments and change – well, I guess comments or changes on that. So for practical purposes, is this what the public will be looking at for their draft as it is right now?

Mr. Nickel: No. So we do plan – that's part of the reason why we are pushing out the public comment period until a bit later, because we do want to make sure that we have the critical area regulations woven into this in the way that we want to present it to the public and for – really, to go through the local adoption process. So there's work for us to do on that section to make that – to make it work better.

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you, guys.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Commissioner Shea, please.

Commissioner Shea: I _____. This is Commissioner Shea. I guess I have a couple questions on you guys's – what section is this? This is Part VIII, Definitions for Agricultural Land. I know I think I mentioned this for a lot of stuff before but maybe just a little extra clarification: So when you're stating that those specific land areas on which agricultural activities are conducted as of the date of the adoption of the local master program, it brings a little question that when you go into the definition of "agricultural activities" and allowing certain fields to be able to be fallow or lie fallow, and so some areas may not be being used for agricultural activities at the date of the adoption, and then it goes into – a little bit further into "aerial photography and other documentation." If you could just explain maybe about *how* you are determining land uses based off of aerial photography, just because that could be confusing sometimes or misleading. And the other part would be the "or other documentation." Is there any way we could specify on the exact document that needs to be referred to, or a combination? Because, I mean, we say it could either be evidence by aerial photography *or* other documentation. Do you not have to have both at the same time? Just more clarification on how you are designating these properties that are within the SMP that are "agricultural activities."

That's kind of the – yeah, so that's kind of the two questions. So how are you determining land use by aerial photography, and then what is the other documentation? And maybe that needs to be specified. But then the second part is, for the date of the adoption of this document, how are you figuring out what properties to the date of adoption of this are being used for agriculture specifically, with the documentation you provided? So, yeah, anyway...

Mr. Nickel: I don't know if – Betsy, do you want to take that? Or I would say, I mean, I don't have a direct answer for you because that's somewhat dependent upon, you know, a local jurisdiction's review process for this. And so I don't know if, Betsy, if you have any input there from your perspective.

Ms. Stevenson: Not really. I was hoping that we'd be able to do it fairly consistently with how we do it _____ portions of our code in terms of ongoing agricultural activities and things. So we do have ways of doing that. If you guys have ideas – Joseph, especially, since you are the one asking the question – of ways that you think we should do that. Clearly there are places that may or may not have been farmed for a while, and it does allow for those to remain that way, so documentation might be a letter from the landowner, as far as I'm concerned – you know, that, yeah, we had this problem with this pest or whatever so we had to keep all the crops out of there for a while and treat, you know, the land or, you know, whatever it may be. I'm going to be wide open, so the less specific we are the better, as far as I'm concerned, because it gives us more flexibility to work with the landowners if they've got a farm plan or something in play that has something in there as part of their farm plan that talks about any of that. So yeah, but if you have concerns – and again I'm going back to Annie: Betsy, you're not going to be here forever. If somebody else gets in there and starts squirrelling around with it we want to make sure that we're protected and that we don't get caught in something. We're happy to, you know, kind of identify or put together some sort of a fact sheet as we go – Hey, what does the documentation look like? What can people use? – something that's a handout that we give to people. In the code, I would much rather leave it fairly open, but any of you who have thoughts who either do farm or have farmed, that would be documentation for you. Like I said, if you can show me, you know, that, Yeah, we have been farming this for forever and right now it's not in production but – you know. What should that look like? Feel free to help us. So I didn't really answer your question but, yeah, okay, go ahead.

Commissioner Shea: Chair Raschko, is it all right if I respond to this real quick? I'm assuming...I understand it's nice to have more less restrictive language within here so you can have something to work with. I understand all that. My main issue is I don't necessarily think that landowners want to be held to a standard that's kind of ambiguous. And so I think aerial photography – I mean, I use it all the time with my work to figure out what's happening on the property, what's nearby – everything like that. So there is some information, but I think definitely if we're going to require people to show evidence of their agriculture production, I think there needs to be a more official third party document that they could be able to reference. Because like you said, one person's letter from their parents or grandparents saying it's been in use, I don't think that that in the legal sense has much backing unless it is very well documented. But just as a landowner, having something – say “other documentation” – you know, what does that mean? Will they accept what I bring in or will they not? And like you say, it all depends on who's reviewing that. And the other part of the date, which I wanted to get into a tiny bit more, was that I really think that there should be more clarification on the timeline of this, because is it conducted – like the whole fallow field, that opens up certain properties do not have production for, let's say, three to five years, and so are we allowing any property that's been produced five years' prior? Are we going all the way back to the '50s and saying, Oh, it was used for agriculture in the '50s so it should be fine now?

So just a little more clarification. I don't have the perfect answer for you. I think aerial photography's great, but I think I definitely think it needs to be used in conjunction with some other either – like you said before, some sort of tax document showing your production. But not all agricultural fields show growth, I guess, or revenue, so that might be hard for some people. So just some thoughts I was thinking.

Hal Hart: This is Hal, the Planning director. Just a quick reference for you, Joseph. 36.70A, Ag Land definition, and WAC 365-190-050 are kind of places to start with – how all 39 counties were asked to look at this back in the 1990-1993 period and there was lots of land use decisions that were based on that designation. It was one of the very first things that all counties had to do is designate natural resource lands. So just as a starting place.

Ms. Stevenson: And we do have good aerials going back to the '30s and we do refer to them all the time when we're trying to see changes on the landscape so we should be able to determine fairly well within a fairly broad range of those lands that have been farmed and may have continued to be farmed even though they may have lapsed for a little bit. But I hear what you're saying and I think you're right. I think that we should have some better idea of what we tell people and how they need to help us with that. So I'm making notes.

Chair Raschko: Okay, next we have Commissioner Knutzen followed by Commissioner Woodmansee. So go ahead, Mark.

Commissioner Knutzen: Thank you, Tim. I have a question for Dan. Dan, you had a slide earlier that had Guemes Island and I think there was nine proposed zoning changes. I think you said it was recommended by the Planning Commission back in 2016. I realize that, of course, it's the Board of County Commissioners that would have to approve that, but my question – I don't – I'm new to this Commission and I don't understand the terminology yet, but my question is: Are those zoning changes more restrictive? Would they be less restrictive? How much input property owners have had, and how much of a problem if these were passed – would there be a problem with the property owners losing some of the rights that they currently have? Can you explain a little bit of how the process will – you expect the process to go down?

Mr. Nickel: Sure, I can do that. I guess first of all the changes that I was talking about, actually there's five of these that the Planning Commission recommended. The Planning Commission actually recommended – essentially what they were recommending is don't make a change. You know, we had proposed changes on Guemes Island from the current designations to something different and the Planning Commission reviewed that and these five specific areas that I mentioned they said actually, No, we don't want to make change. Let's just keep what we have currently. Okay, so that – I can bring this back up so I can speak to this real quick because I've got this on my screen. So these are the five areas circled – these red squares, okay, that the Planning Commission suggested we return and don't make a change. Keep the existing designations. In the areas – the other circles, so this, like, number two here. This is an area that we've identified to be Shoreline Residential. And again, I'm not sure based on this map right here what it was currently. But we were making proposed changes. There's not a lot of them, but there are some proposed changes here to the Shoreline Environment Designations, and I will say in some cases it's based on ecological conditions and that's typically when something is actually more of a natural condition – either a park area or an open space – and it makes sense to move that into a natural designation. There's other areas in which underlying land use or underlying zoning makes it important that we actually make things to a more allowable designation, like a Shoreline Residential or a High Intensity designation. In those cases, we're actually making things maybe less stringent because you're recognizing that it has a certain development pattern. And so we were very, you know, cognizant and aware of those actions to make sure that what we're proposing isn't going to be necessarily more restrictive. It's going to be actually something that meets what the current land use really is. Both from land use and ecological function standpoints.

So hopefully that, you know, kind of gets at what we were doing but it also gets at what the 2016 Planning Commission recommendation was – was actually to revert back to the current condition.

Commissioner Knutzen: Thank you, Dan. That helps a lot, Dan. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Woodmansee, please.

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, I was going to speak to the shoreline thing that Joe was talking about. So I guess what I'm seeing here is that we're not – historical data is – you know, there's lots of it out there so I don't think that that's an issue. I think the idea here is we don't want to take any ag acres out of production or possible production. Not everything's – not 100% of the land in production was – the idea here is to keep as many acres in production as possible is really the goal, the way I'm reading it and the way I see it.

Chair Raschko: Okay, any comment?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: All right. Thank you, Joe. Any more questions for staff or for Dan or Betsy?

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay, any final thoughts?

Mr. Nickel: Well, I will chime in if I can, just to kind of go back to one of my original questions, and that is – you know, we've got time set aside at the next meeting, and I guess at that point in time hopefully we have some, you know, information to share with you regarding, you know, our discussions with the Department of Ecology and, like we addressed earlier, regarding the critical areas question we have some more information to present to you at that point in time. It's not clear to us quite yet what that will be, but I guess I'd look for any input from you guys to help us frame out anything else that we should elaborate on and maybe provide more detail or more answers to. So I'd be open to hear any recommendations on that.

Chair Raschko: Are there any recommendations from the Planning Commission to help this effort?

Commissioner Mitchell: Not at this time! Thank you. It's going to take some thinking, but I appreciate the cue to try working on that some more, Dan.

(silence)

Chair Raschko: Okay. Mr. Woodmansee, did you have more?

Commissioner Woodmansee: No. No – oh, I'm sorry. Let me get rid of that.

Chair Raschko: No problem!

Commissioner Woodmansee: There. It's gone.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Dan. Well, I guess it's up to you, Dan!

(laughter)

Mr. Nickel: Okay, it's like an open book just waiting!

Chair Raschko: Okay. Well, anyway, I presume this concludes your presentation. I want to thank you, Dan, and Betsy, as well, for your effort once again. And we look forward to seeing you again next time.

Mr. Nickel: Thank you very much.

Ms. Stevenson: Thank you, guys, for your time.

Chair Raschko: Okay, we'll turn next to the Director's Update. So, Mr. Hart, please.

Mr. Hart: Thank you, Commissioner, Chair Raschko. Peter has it. We'll go ahead and share the screen. Peter?

Mr. Gill: Yep.

Mr. Hart: Okay. Let's go to the next one. I should put some color in this! So we have continued picking up speed this year and I wanted to let you know that we are seeing additional projects that have been put on hold are coming back. So December we had a big spike. January was also a spike and strong, and as I mentioned in the last couple of Commissioner briefings, that it remains strong. And now what we're seeing at the end of February and starting into March projects that were put on hold last year, really significant projects – some of the biggest projects we've seen – may come back now. So they're asking, Hey, what's going on? So PACCAR expansion potentially; others that were put on hold because of either national issues or international issues may come back and so we'll keep you updated.

Let's go to the next slide. This is one that's moving ahead. I wanted to show you what it actually looks like if you were to drive around. This is from last Thursday, I think, so it's probably a lot further along now. But this is going to be a commercial jet. Small private jets would be in there. And that's new to the Port and also new to the county. There's a huge demand for this kind of hangar space everywhere. In general aviation small airplanes are getting pushed around. They're getting pushed out of Arlington. Arlington Airport and the surrounding area has become the hub for future growth – right? – in that north area. Tons of thousands of jobs are expected there. That has an impact on us. Not only are they putting tens of thousands of jobs there, they're putting tens of thousands of people there too. But that's not how we're set up. We're set up as general aviation and so we're seeing some of the spillover of this generation right now. So this is would be at least part of that.

Let's go to the next slide, please. So things keep changing, right? So this is Legends brand. This is a fairly significant building as buildings go in our county. Legends has been a very successful company. They're transferring people up here and they kind of put this on hold for a while as well, but then once they got their footing under them they said, Nope, we're going to go ahead with this building. So let's go to the next slide.

The next one is our seed company, Sakata and Vikima Seed. Both of them on the left near the existing Sakata but across the street from it at the airport, you would see, I believe, a greenhouse – a series of greenhouses, I think is what it was. It's been a while since I've seen those plans. And then this is Vikima Seed Company. There are several other projects coming as well. So each week I brief the County Commissioners on State Environmental Policy Act or SEPA's that are done throughout the region, and so expect a processing facility for local animals and other things to come in to this area. There's the list that I was just talking about, but don't also forget you can't – it's hard to get to it. The only reason I get to it is because we do inspections out there. The

Westland Barrel Rooms are now in progress, which is a concrete vault at this point. And then it'll go up from that. And then there are various processing facilities that are going on in the airport too. So commercial activity is a really big part of our overall growth in the county and we are seeing that employment growth. The problem with that is it needs housing but it also – we also have some aerospace that's come in in the last year, which I haven't mentioned at all. But that includes engineering and potentially more aerospace coming into the area as well. And let's go to the next one.

The one thing I'll mention that Chair Janicki mentioned: We're talking about climate change. We're talking about salmon recovery. We're talking about rural economic development. There's four more and I can send you these if you want to look at these bills – if you really want to go through it – relating to the changes relating to effective dates of adoption for our Comprehensive Plan updates. GMA work plans, and then those rural Areas of More Intense Rural Development. All those are still alive in the legislature right now, and we're well beyond – we're about the 60th – you know, 60% through the legislative session. And so a lot of that stuff is alive. This will have direct impacts on what you do and what I do in '22 for sure, and probably beyond. So, you know, it's interesting to see that. The spaghetti is being made right now in Olympia. It will have impacts here in Skagit County to be sure. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Shea has a question.

Commissioner Shea: I think Mitchell was first, but I just want to say if you don't mind sending a link to those, if that's at all possible, just to make it easier –

Mr. Hart: Yep.

Commissioner Shea: – for navigating, that'd be great.

Mr. Hart: You bet. I will send that in the morning. I've already given it to Kim so I'll tell Kim to go ahead and send that so that you all get it in the morning.

Chair Raschko: Okay, Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: Thank you, Joseph. That's exactly what I was going – I was going to ask for all this material ___ can read those please. Hal, you know the more the better! Thank you.

Mr. Hart: Yep.

Chair Raschko: Anymore questions for staff?

Mr. Gill: I just wanted to remind folks that the next Planning Commission meeting is the 23rd of March and hopefully we'll be wrapping up the SMP work session at that meeting. Also I wanted to let folks know that the docket will be introduced to the Board also, tentatively on the 23rd. I'll send out an email and make sure people know when that schedule gets firmed up. But we're looking at the 23rd right now for just an introduction, not a hearing or anything like that. So just to let them know what's on the docket – or the petitions for the docket.

And finally, and maybe most importantly, is I wanted to quickly introduce our new intern for long range planning. Daniel Hasenoehrl is on the line with us right now. He is a native of Mount Vernon and he recently graduated from Eastern Washington with a degree in urban – or planning,

anyway. And we're very happy to have him and he's going to help take minutes at these meetings. So you may be hearing from him in the near future. That's all I have. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Are there any more questions? I have a quick one for Mr. Hart.

Mr. Hart: Yes, sir.

Chair Raschko: What is Legends going to do in that big building?

Mr. Hart: You know, I'll have to go back and look at it. I think it is a warehouse mostly.

Chair Raschko: Okay.

Mr. Hart: So that they can – when they have to surge materials out to flood zones, they can do that.

Chair Raschko: All right. Well, thank you. Thank you much for the update. We'll turn now to Planning Commissioner Comments and Announcements. We'll start with Commissioner Lundsten, but I first have a question, Mark. Could you please clarify your status? You stated that you were resigning – what did you say? – immediately. Could you please explain what your intentions are?

Commissioner Lundsten: Yes, I meant at the end of this meeting.

Chair Raschko: At the end of this meeting. So is there a process? Are you going to write a letter or resignation and that makes it official, or –

Commissioner Lundsten: I'm going to announce it and then I was going to contact all the parties involved and discover what the process was advised to be and follow it.

Chair Raschko: Right.

Commissioner Lundsten: So this was my first announcement. That's all. And with the Board here, I was basically done with my statement so I will forward that on to them and to you. And I wanted – if – does that answer your question?

Chair Raschko: That does.

Commissioner Lundsten: And I'm – so thank you to the – I wanted to say thanks to Peter for all his work with the Commission and also to Hal and Mike, who have – I've enjoyed working with all of you. You've done a good job and I appreciated getting to know you all. Thank you to all the members of the Commission. I have actually gotten to know you and I've appreciated it and I thank you for your work and your effort, and I wish you the best. We have, it appears to be, irreconcilable differences about what I consider to be some fundamental things. As I have said at the very start of this, I do not make this personal. I consider it a matter of fundamentals of how we operate. So I have no personal hard feelings towards anyone here and I hope that the same can be said eventually – it may be already – about me. So good luck to everyone, and thanks again to the staff and to all members of the Commission. I am one who loves this place, my family loves this place, and I feel like I spent a lifetime going up and down the Inside Passage and now I live in the front yard of that Inside Passage. So that's my – that's what I look at every morning when I

get up and every night before I go to bed I can actually see the light on Smith Island. So thank you all and I appreciate the time to make the comment. And Godspeed to all of us.

Chair Raschko: Thank you, Mark. Commissioner Woodmansee, have you anything?

Commissioner Woodmansee: Yeah, I wanted to – I guess I want to give kudos to the County staff. I've had to recently be in and out of County buildings a little bit here recently, and most of which are not operating normally. And I've just noticed that the professionalism and their ability to adapt and deal with the public – because my interaction has been as a person in the public, not as a Commissioner – I just want to give them a shout out because they do a good job and it's not an easy thing to run a county when you can't have any face-to-face meetings and stuff like that, and so I just want to say that I appreciate their efforts. I do look forward to the day that we can walk into the buildings again and hopefully that's not too far off. But I just want to say I've had quite a few interactions here lately and it's just – I wanted to give a shout out to the County workers.

Lastly, Mark, I wish you the best. I hope that, you know, 2021 is a – for you as well as everybody else – is much better than 2020. And just – I wish you the best in the future. Thank you for your time on the Commission.

Commissioner Lundsten: Thanks, Joe.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Commissioner Shea?

Commissioner Shea: Nothing special. I just wanted to say thanks for everyone's time and good luck on the new venture there, Commissioner Lundsten.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Rose?

Commissioner Rose: I don't really have anything. I guess I could thank everybody too.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. I see – Mr. Hart, you have your hand up?

Mr. Hart: Yes, thank you. You had asked what was going to be in that so I went back through my emails, Commissioners, and 85,000 feet of warehouse, 15,000 square feet of office, Commissioners. So to be a little bit more exact, that's what they told us on the building permit. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Well, thanks for the effort. It was just a little bit of curiosity.

Mr. Hart: Yep.

Chair Raschko: Thank you. Okay. Did we hear from Commissioner Rose? I'm sorry.

Commissioner Rose: You already heard from me.

Chair Raschko: Okay. Commissioner Mitchell?

Commissioner Mitchell: I really appreciated having the time with the Board of County Commissioners. And, Hal, with the continued updates, that's always very helpful. And I appreciate what staff's been doing, especially knowing that they've got a pretty heavy lift. And as always, as

early as information we can see and process the better, so we can talk to some people and ask more questions. And thank you, guys – everybody – for your professionalism.

Chair Raschko: Okay, thank you. Commissioner Knutzen?

Commissioner Knutzen: Yeah, thank you, Tim. I don't have anything to say at this time. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: All right. Commissioner Hughes?

Commissioner Hughes: I have nothing to say. Thank you.

Chair Raschko: Commissioner Candler?

Commissioner Candler: Thank you. I don't have any announcements or anything that hasn't been said. I appreciate everyone's graciousness in thanking everyone.

Chair Raschko: Okay. I'd just like to say to Commissioner Lundsten that I appreciate your sentiments at the end. And I agree, we just have differences perhaps. And I wish you very well going forward. Thank you for the time that you have put in and all the hard work you've done.

Commissioner Lundsten: Thanks, Tim.

Chair Raschko: And I thank the staff for their hard work tonight, and that concludes our agenda so we will stand adjourned. Thank you, everybody. Have a good night.